



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/388,989	09/02/1999	BARNEY M. COHEN	AMAT/3191.03	4766

32588 7590 04/30/2003

APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.  
2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER
----------

PADGETT, MARIANNE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

28

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/388,989

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

28

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07(f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
- b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see NOTE below);
- c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

4. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Telephone interview of 4/17/03  
Removes the art objections based on Chang et al as a primary reference for reasons discussed in the
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: reducing plasmas are employed by both references, you do not

7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-4, 6, 8-14, 17-23 + 33

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: cancelled - claims 24-32, 2, 5, 7, 15-16

9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

11. ☒ Other: Supplied any convincing evidence that two reducing plasmas used for the same purposes would not have been equivalently applied.
- The IDS was reviewed, the JP reference to Yamauchi has teaching similar to Zhao et al in its English abstract (Induction plasma cleaning with H<sub>2</sub> inactive gas). A Bell Translation has been ordered. References B1 + B2 are not prior art. B1-C1 has no cleaning plasmas (only deposition) and C2 uses H<sub>2</sub> plasma to convert a layer of Cu oxide to Cu metal, not cleaning.

☒ PTO-413 - Interview Summary, paper #26  
FORM PTO-303 (Rev. 11/00) 4/17/03

☒ PTO-1449 of 4/6/03 (paper #25)

MARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER